

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-26 are pending. Claims 18-26 have been amended.

Claims 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo et al. (U.S. 6,247,032) in view of Challenger et al (U.S. 6,256,712). Applicants respectfully traverse, however, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended certain claims.

Amended claim 18 describes associating content approval workflow processes with the web site component (e.g., Specification, paragraph 7); detecting an update of the web site component; in response to detecting the update, choosing a content approval workflow process from the content approval workflow processes based on at least one of an identity of the updated component, a particular group of components to which the updated component belongs, and a priority level associated with each of the content approval workflow processes and executing the chosen content approval workflow process to assess whether the updated web site component is approved (e.g., Specification, paragraphs 45 and 48); and deploying the updated web site component while maintaining referential integrity of the website by: adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed, and, in response to determining that at least one web site component being deployed fails to properly deploy, rolling back the deployment transaction (e.g., Specification, paragraph 39).

The Bernardo patent provides a tool for creating a Web site (e.g., Col. 2, lines 28-29). The Bernardo patent describes that automated routing for site approval to authorized approvers specified during creation of the web site is provided (Abstract).

By teaching that routing is to authorized approvers specified during creation of the web site, the Bernardo patent teaches away from *associating content approval workflow processes with the web site component and choosing a content approval workflow process from the content approval workflow processes based on at least one of an identity of the updated component, a particular group of components to which the updated component belongs, and a priority level associated with each of the content approval workflow processes.*

The Challenger patent describes a trigger monitor monitoring object sources (Col. 30, lines 51-53). The Challenger patent also describes that, when an object source detects a change, a trigger is invoked, and the trigger is typically used to cause actions to occur automatically in response to modification of the data (Col. 29, lines 40-44). The Challenger patent does not cure the defects of the Bernardo patent.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Bernardo nor the Challenger patents teaches or suggests deploying the updated web site component while maintaining referential integrity of the website by: adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed, and, *in response to determining that at least one web site component being deployed fails to properly deploy, rolling back the deployment transaction.*

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 18 is not taught or suggested by the Bernardo and Challenger patents, either alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 19-25 each incorporate the language of independent claim 18 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 19-25 are not taught or suggested by the Bernardo and Challenger patents, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 18.

Moreover, amended claim 19 describes reviewing a plurality of component relationships to determine components that depend on the updated component; choosing a particular dependent update workflow process to launch based on at least one of a dependent component that is involved and the component that has been updated (e.g., Specification, paragraph 47); and executing the chosen dependent update workflow process.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Bernardo nor the Challenger patents teaches or suggests choosing a particular dependent update workflow process to launch based on at least one of a dependent component that is involved and the component that has been updated and executing the chosen dependent update workflow process.

Amended claim 26 describes detecting an update of a web site component, the web site component being one of a plurality of web site components defining structure and content of a web site, wherein the plurality of web site components are stored in a multilevel hierarchical

structure; in response to detecting the update, reviewing a plurality of relationships to determine components that depend on the updated component; choosing a particular dependent update workflow process to launch based on at least one of a dependent component that is involved and the component that has been updated (e.g., Specification, paragraph 47); and executing the chosen dependent update workflow process to execute at least one operation on at least one of the determined dependent components, wherein the at least one executed operation relates to updating the at least one determined dependent component.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Bernardo nor the Challenger patents teaches or suggests the subject matter of amended claim 26. For example, there is no teaching in the cited patents of *choosing a particular dependent update workflow process to launch based on at least one of a dependent component that is involved and the component that has been updated.*

#### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: December 4, 2008

By:       /Janaki K. Davda/      

Janaki K. Davda  
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7973  
Fax: 310-556-7984